

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dan et al. (USPN 6,560,639).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits herewith an amended set of claims in which the independent claims have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, the provision of the following three elements:

- ☐ a delta table that represents changes made in a work area to Web site content, extended attributes of said Web site and information related to said Web site;
- ☐ a base table that records and accumulates all changes to a Web site, including changes to Web site content, extended attributes of said Web site, and information related to said Web site; and
- ☐ a tracking table configured to manage the existence and relationship of the delta table and the base table.

Support for these claim limitations is seen throughout the specification, for example reference may be had to page 9, lines 6-17.

Additionally, the claims have been amended to indicate that with regard to the work areas, "each work area [comprises]... a virtual copy of an entire Web site."

Applicant has revised the claims as set forth above solely for purposes of expediting examination of the application and not as a concession of the correctness of the Examiner's rejections in the above-referenced Office Action. Applicant affirmatively asserts that it is not Applicant's intention to abandon claim coverage of a broader scope, that Applicant is entitled to claim coverage of broader scope, and that Applicant

explicitly reserves its right to pursue claim coverage of broader scope at a later time. However, for purposes of expediency, as mentioned above, Applicant submits that the claims as now comprised, are no way taught by the cited reference.

A rejection for lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) requires that the single reference teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Here, it is clear that Applicant's structure of a delta table, base table, and tracking table are nowhere found in the Dan reference. Further, Dan is not concerned with providing virtual copies of an entire Web site.

With regard to the first point above, the Examiner indicates that Dan's system comprises a delta table and a base table. The Examiner makes reference to various portions of the Dan document. The Examiner's position in connection with these aspects of the claimed invention is set forth in paragraph 13, page 5 of the above-recited Office Action. A close read of these cited sections indicates that there is no concept of the three claimed tables anywhere to be found. While Dan teaches that it is possible to modify existing Web pages with available Web page attributes (column 4, lines 5-10), the pages themselves are not modified. Further, there is no teaching of a particular structure of tables for tracking a Web page, changes to the Web page, and the tables themselves. That is, there is no structure recited in Dan that teaches the claim limitations of a delta table, base table, and tracking table.


Further, Dan is concerned with tracking Web page attributes. The attributes of Web pages are not the pages themselves. While Dan teaches that Web pages may be cached in a file system, Dan does not teach the provision of work areas that comprise virtual copies of an entire Web site.

In view of the foregoing, Dan fails to teach each and every element of the presently claimed invention. Further, one skilled in the art would not consider Dan should one be presented with the desire to produce an invention, such as that set forth by the Applicant, because there is no motivation in Dan to produce a system such as that

claimed, there is no likelihood of success based on the teachings of Dan (for example, the three table structure is nowhere to be found in Dan and one skilled in the art would have no notion of how to implement such structure absent of some teaching or suggestion thereof), and Dan does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention, nor would one of ordinary skill in the art supplement Dan with well known information to produce the claimed invention.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, the claimed invention is deemed to be in allowable condition, and Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's reconsideration of rejection and allowance of the application as now claimed. Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862